

WO

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Daniel Barsanti, et al.,

No. CV-25-00303-PHX-KML

Plaintiffs,

## ORDER

V.

Cameron DeLoach, et al.,

## Defendants.

On December 20, 2025, plaintiffs filed their complaint in the Northern District of California. Plaintiffs then waited a little more than three weeks to file their ex parte motion for a temporary restraining order. (Doc. 6.) On January 15, 2025, the Northern District of California ordered plaintiffs to serve the motion. That order also required defendants file a response by January 17, 2025, which defendants did. (Docs. 10, 14.)

The Northern District held a hearing on January 22, 2025, and ordered the case transferred to the District of Arizona. The Northern District ruled defendants had “waived the right to enforce” a forum selection clause found in the governing agreement. (Doc. 19 at 6.) The case was not docketed in the District of Arizona until January 30, 2025. (Doc. 20.)

Plaintiffs initially filed in an improper venue where personal jurisdiction was lacking, which resulted in defendants devoting much of their briefing to issues of jurisdiction and venue. Examining the claims and alleged harms, obtaining full briefing on the merits is appropriate. Defendants must file a renewed opposition and plaintiffs must

1 file a reply.

2 Accordingly,

3 **IT IS ORDERED** no later than **February 6, 2025**, defendants shall file a revised  
4 response to the motion for temporary restraining focusing on the merits of plaintiffs'  
5 request. Defendants should also address whether the forum selection clause remains  
6 relevant. Plaintiffs shall file a reply no later than **February 10, 2025**.

7 Dated this 31st day of January, 2025.

8  
9 

10 Honorable Krissa M. Lanham  
11 United States District Judge

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28